arXiv:1510.02576v1 [math.CV] 9 Oct 2015

DIFFERENCE NEVANLINNA THEORIES WITH VANISHING AND INFINITE PERIODS

YIK-MAN CHIANG AND XU-DAN LUO

Abstract. By extending the idea of a difference operator with a fixed step to varying-steps difference operators, we have established a difference Nevanlinna theory for meromorphic functions with the steps tending to zero (vanishing period) and a difference Nevanlinna theory for finite order meromorphic functions with the steps tending to infinity (infinite period) in this paper. We can recover the classical little Picard theorem from the vanishing period theory, but we require additional finite order growth restriction for meromorphic functions from the infinite period theory. Then we give some applications of our theories to exhibit connections between discrete equations and and their continuous analogues.

1. Introduction

Halburd and Korhonen [10] established a new discrete-type Picard theorem and Picard-values for finite-order meromorphic functions defined on $\mathbb{C}$ verses the classical Picard theorem and Picard values. More specifically, their theory allows them to show that if there are three a_j-points $j = 1, 2, 3$ in $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ such that each pre-image $f^{-1}(a_j)$ is an infinite sequence consisting of points lying on a straight line on which any two consecutive points differ by a fixed difference c (but is otherwise arbitrary), then the function must be a periodic function with period c. This result can be considered as a discrete version of the classical Picard theorem for finite order meromorphic functions.

We consider the cases with *vanishing period* and *infinite period*, that is, when $c \to 0$ and $c \to \infty$ respectively. On the one hand, if we denote $c = \eta$ when it tends to zero via a sequence $\eta_n \to 0$, then a periodic functions sequence guaranteed by Halburd-Korhonen's theory for each n would have their periods tending to zero in a formal manner. Thus the periodic function with a vanishing period, when suitably defined, would *formally* reduce to a constant. On the other hand, if we denote $c = \omega$ when it tends to infinity via a sequence $\omega_n \to \infty$, then the periods of the periodic functions sequence from the Halburd-Korhonen theory would become infinite, and the distance between any two consecutive points on each of the three pre-image infinite sequences would become sparse and eventually reduce to a single point at most in the limit formally. In both cases that have been described, one would *formally* recover the original little Picard theorem (namely the

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 30D35; 30D15; 39A05; 39A70 .

Key words and phrases. Nevanlinna theory, varying-steps difference operator with vanishing and infinite periods, Difference equations.

31st May 2015.

This research was supported in part by the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (601111).

inverse images of each of three Picard values, must be a finite set at most). In this paper, we vigorously establish the above formal considerations indeed hold under certain senses. The upshot is that we can recover the classical Picard theorem as $\eta \to 0$ *without* the finite-order restriction and *with* the finite-order restriction when $\omega \to \infty$. In fact, our argument for our vanishing period results is *independent* of Halburd-Korhonen's theory, while we apply methods similar to our earlier works [2]-[3] and Halburd-Korhonen's theory [10] in the infinite period results. We remark that the above finite order restriction in the infinite period case is necessary as no such result would be possible for general meromorphic functions. An estimate of the proximity function $m(r,\, f(z+\eta))$ was given in [4, (70)] for unrestricted η ($|\eta| < |z|$) and meromorphic functions with unrestricted growth.

The Halburd-Korhonen discrete Picard theorem for finite-order meromorphic functions follows from their difference-type Nevanlinna theory based on the difference operator $\Delta_c f(z) = f(z+c) - f(z)$ (verse Nevanlinna's original theory based on the differential operator $\frac{d}{dz}f$). We consider a difference operator with *varying steps*

$$\Delta_{c_z} f(z) = f(z + c_z) - f(z), \tag{1.1}$$

that is, the *step size* c_z is *a function of* z itself, although the dependence is usually related to $|z|$ in our applications below.

Hitherto we shall use the notation η for c when we consider the vanishing period case, and use the notation ω for c when we consider the infinite period case. Thus when the rates at which $\eta \to 0$ and $\omega \to \infty$ are suitably chosen, and *Picard exceptional values* suitably defined respectively, we have obtained:

(1) when a meromorphic function f has three Picard exceptional values with respect to a *varying-steps difference operator with vanishing period*, then f is a constant (Theorem 4.7);
(2) when a finite-order meromorphic function f with three Picard exceptional values with respect to a *varying-steps difference operator of infinite period*, then f is a constant (Theorem 5.5).

The case (1) above gives an alternative proof of the original little Picard theorem. The case (2) requires additional finite-order restriction.

Let f be an arbitrary meromorphic function and $\eta_z \to 0$ as $z \to \infty$. Then we obtain

$$m\Big(r,\, \frac{f(z+\eta_z)}{f(z)}\Big) = o(1), \tag{1.2}$$

for all r and if in addition that f has no pole in certain deleted neighbourhood of 0, then

$$N\big(r,\, f(z+\eta_z)\big) = N\big(r,\, f(z)\big) + O(\log r) \tag{1.3}$$

for all r.

When f has positive finite order σ and $\omega_z \to \infty$ suitably restricted by $|\omega_z| < r^\beta$, $0 < \beta < 1$ as $z \to \infty$, then we have

$$m\Big(r,\ \frac{f(z+\omega_z)}{f(z)}\Big) = O(r^{\sigma-(1-\beta)(1-\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}), \tag{1.4}$$

for all r and

$$N\big(r,\ f(z+\omega_z)\big) = N\big(r,\ f(z)\big) + O(r^{\sigma-(1-\beta)+\varepsilon}) \tag{1.5}$$

when $\sigma \geq 1$,

$$N\big(r,\ f(z+\omega_z)\big) = N\big(r,\ f(z)\big) + O(r^{\beta}) \tag{1.6}$$

when $0 < \sigma < 1$

for r outside a set of finite logarithmic measure. We have also obtained corresponding estimates for meromorphic functions with finite logarithmic order.

Finally, we show a different kind of vanishing period result for finite order meromorphic function:

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} m\Big(r,\ \frac{1}{\eta_z}\left(\frac{f(z+\eta_z)}{f(z)} - 1\right)\Big) = O(\log r) = m\Big(r, \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)}\Big) \tag{1.7}$$

thus recovering Nevanlinna's original logarithmic derivative estimate for finite order functions via yet another approach independent of previous methods although we do not have an immediate application of this result to Nevanlinna theory.

This paper is organised as follows. We state the main theorems in §2 and §3. We shall establish Nevanlinna theory for difference operator in terms of vanishing and infinite periods in §4 and §5 respectively. We recall some known results in §6. The proofs of main results are written in §7 to §12. We exhibit some applications of our results to obtain classical differential equation results from their difference counterparts in §13. A re-formulation of logarithmic derivative lemma and corresponding proof are placed in §14.

2. Main results for vanishing period

Theorem 2.1. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}$, $0 < |\eta| < \alpha_1(r)$, where $r = |z|$*

$$\alpha_1(r) = \min\left\{1/r, 1/\left(n(r+1)\right)^2\right\}, \quad n(r) = n(r,\ f) + n\left(r, 1/f\right).$$

Then we have

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} m\Big(r,\ \frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big) + \lim_{r\to\infty} m\Big(r,\ \frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big) = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Moreover, for each fixed r,

$$\lim_{\eta\to 0} m\Big(r,\ \frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big) + \lim_{\eta\to 0} m\Big(r,\ \frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big) = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

By Theorem 2.1, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.2. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function, $0 < r = |z|$ is a fixed but is otherwise arbitrary. Then*

$$\lim_{\eta\to 0} m\big(r, f(z+\eta)\big) = m\big(r, f(z)\big). \tag{2.3}$$

We next result is about an asymptotic relation for counting functions.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}$, $0 < r = |z|$ is a fixed, but is otherwise arbitrary, such that $0 < |\eta| < \alpha_2(r)$, where*

$$\alpha_2(r) = \min\Big\{r, \frac{1}{r}, \frac{h}{2}, \frac{1}{\sum_{0<|b_\mu|<r+\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{|b_\mu|}}\Big\}, \tag{2.4}$$

here $(b_\mu)_{\mu\in N}$ is the sequence of poles of $f(z)$, and $h \in (0,\, 1)$ such that $f(z)$ has no poles in $\overline{D}(0,\, h) \setminus \{0\}$. Then

$$N\big(r, f(z+\eta)\big) = N\big(r,\, f(z)\big) + \varepsilon_1(r), \tag{2.5}$$

where $|\varepsilon_1(r)| \le n\,(0, f(z)) \log r + 3$.

Combining the above asymptotic relations, we obtain the following estimate for the Nevanlinna characteristic function.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}$, then there exists $\beta(r) > 0$ such that*

$$T\big(r,\, f(z+\eta)\big) = T\big(r,\, f(z)\big) + \varepsilon(r) \tag{2.6}$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| < \beta(r)$, where $|\varepsilon(r)| \le n\,(0, f(z)) \log r + 4$ and $\lim\limits_{r\to\infty} \beta(r) = 0$.

In order to understand these asymptotic relations, we will give the following remark.

Remark 2.5. Miles showed in [16] that the deficiency of meromorphic functions may change when choosing different origin. But Chiang and Feng [2] showed the asymptotic relations

$$N\big(r,\, f(z+\eta)\big) = N(r,\, f) + O(r^{\lambda-1+\epsilon}) + O(\log r) \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$T\big(r,\, f(z+\eta)\big) = T(r,\, f) + O(r^{\sigma-1+\varepsilon}) + O(\log r) \tag{2.8}$$

for finite order meromorphic function $f(z)$, where λ denotes the exponent of convergence of poles of $f(z)$. This implies that the deficiency does not change after shifting the origin if the difference of the order and lower orders is less than 1. By applying the estimates (2.7) and (2.8), one can easily obtain an alternative proof of an earlier result of Valiron's result [19] that if a finite order meromorphic function with the difference of its order and lower order less then unity, then the deficiency at the origin, i.e., $\delta(0)$ does not change by a finite shift. This result of Valiron no longer hold in general. See Miles [16]. However, Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 indicate

that the deficiency remains the same by shifting a vanishing period without any restriction of order.

3. Main results for infinite period

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order σ, $0 < \beta < 1$ and $0 < |\omega| < r^{\beta}$. Then given $0 < \varepsilon < (1-\beta)/(2-\beta)$, we have*

$$m\Big(r,\, \frac{f(z+\omega)}{f(z)}\Big) + m\Big(r,\, \frac{f(z)}{f(z+\omega)}\Big) = O\big(r^{\sigma-(1-\beta)(1-\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\big). \tag{3.1}$$

Similarly, we have asymptotic relations for the Nevanlinna counting function and characteristic function of infinite period.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order $\sigma = \sigma(f)$.*

(i) *If $\sigma \geq 1$, $0 < \beta < 1$ and $0 < |\omega| < r^{\beta}$, then given $0 < \varepsilon < \beta'$, where $\beta' = \min\{\sigma(1-\beta)/\beta,\ 1-\beta\}$, we have*

$$N\big(r,\, f(z+\omega)\big) = N(r,\, f) + O\big(r^{\sigma-(1-\beta)+\varepsilon}\big) \tag{3.2}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure.

(ii) *if $0 < \sigma < 1$, $0 < \beta < \sigma$ and $0 < |\omega| < r^{\beta}$, then given $0 < \varepsilon < \beta''$, where $\beta'' = \min\{\sigma(1-\beta)/\beta,\ 1-\sigma\}$, we have*

$$N\big(r,\, f(z+\omega)\big) = N(r,\, f) + O\left(r^{\beta}\right) \tag{3.3}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure.

(iii) *if $\sigma = 0$, $0 < |\omega| < \log^{\frac{1}{2}} r$ for $r > 1$, $0 < |\omega| < 1$ for $r \leq 1$, then given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we have*

$$N\big(r,\, f(z+\omega)\big) = N\big(r,\, f\big) + O\big(\log r\big) \tag{3.4}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite logarithmic order $\sigma_{\log} = \limsup_{r\to\infty} \log^{+} T(r,\, f)/\log\log r > 1$, $1 < \beta < \sigma_{\log}$ and $0 < |\omega| < \log^{\beta} r$. Then given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we have*

$$N\big(r,\, f(z+\omega)\big) = N(r,\, f) + O(\log^{\beta} r) \tag{3.5}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure.

We deduce from the Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and Corollary 3.3 the following theorem.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order $\sigma = \sigma(f)$.*

(i) *If $\sigma \geq 1$, let $0 < \beta < 1$ and $0 < |\omega| < r^{\beta}$. Then given $0 < \varepsilon < (1-\beta)/(2-\beta)$, we have*

$$T\big(r,\, f(z+\omega)\big) = T(r,\, f) + O\big(r^{\sigma-(1-\beta)(1-\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\big) \tag{3.6}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure.

(ii) *$0 < \sigma < 1$, let $0 < \beta < \sigma$ and $0 < |\omega| < r^{\beta}$. Then given $0 < \varepsilon < \beta'''$, where $\beta''' = \min\{\sigma(1-\beta)/\beta,\ (1-\sigma)/(2-\beta)\}$, we have*

$$T\big(r,\, f(z+\omega)\big) = T(r,\, f) + O(r^{\beta}) \tag{3.7}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure.

(iii) *Moreover, if $\sigma = 0$, let $0 < |\omega| < \log^{\frac{1}{2}} r$ for $r > 1$, $0 < |\omega| < 1$ for $r \leq 1$, then given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we have*

$$T\big(r,\, f(z+\omega)\big) = T(r,\, f) + O(\log r) \tag{3.8}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure.

Then we immediately have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite logarithmic order $\sigma_{\log} > 1$. Suppose $0 < |\omega| < \log^{\beta} r$ with $1 < \beta < \sigma_{\log}$. Then given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we have*

$$T\big(r,\, f(z+\omega)\big) = T(r,\, f) + O(\log^{\beta} r) \tag{3.9}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure.

4. Nevanlinna theory for difference operator with vanishing period

We assume that the step size $c = \eta_z$ in (1.1) to be non-zero and whose upper bound tends to zero as $z \to \infty$ throughout this section.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function such that $\Delta_{\eta_z} f \not\equiv 0$ for each z, and let $p \geq 2$ be a positive integer, $a_1, \cdots, a_p$ be p distinct points in $\mathbb{C}$. Then there exists $\delta(r) > 0$ such that*

$$m(r,\, f) + \sum_{k=1}^{p} m\big(r,\, 1/(f-a_k)\big) \leq 2\, T(r,\, f) - N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, f) + \gamma \tag{4.1}$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| < \delta(r)$, where γ is a constant which depends on $a_1, \cdots, a_p$ and is independent of z,

$$N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r, f) := 2N(r, f) - N(r, \Delta_{\eta_z} f) + N\left(r, 1/\Delta_{\eta_z} f\right). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Set

$$P(f) = \prod_{k=1}^{p} (f - a_k), \tag{4.3}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{p} m\left(r,\, 1/(f-a_k)\right) &= \sum_{k=1}^{p} T\left(r,\, 1/(f-a_k)\right) - \sum_{k=1}^{p} N\left(r,\, 1/(f-a_k)\right)\\ &= pT(r,f) - N\left(r, 1/P(f)\right) + \gamma\\ &= T(r,P(f)) - N\left(r, 1/P(f)\right) + \gamma\\ &= m\left(r, 1/P(f)\right) + \gamma.\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

From Theorem 2.1, we get for each $r > 0$, we can find a $\delta(r) > 0$ such that

$$m\Big(r, \frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big) \leq 1 \tag{4.5}$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| < \delta(r)$. Then

$$m\Big(r, \frac{\Delta_{\eta_z} f}{f - a_k}\Big) = \gamma, \tag{4.6}$$

which implies that

$$m\Big(r, \frac{\Delta_{\eta_z} f}{P(f)}\Big) = \gamma. \tag{4.7}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{k=1}^{p} m\Big(r, \frac{1}{f-a_k}\Big) \leq m\Big(r, \frac{1}{\Delta_{\eta_z} f}\Big) + \gamma = T\left(r, \Delta_{\eta_z} f\right) - N\Big(r, \frac{1}{\Delta_{\eta_z} f}\Big) + \gamma\\ &= m\Big(r,\ f \cdot \frac{\Delta_{\eta_z} f}{f}\Big) + N\left(r, \Delta_{\eta_z} f\right) - N\Big(r, \frac{1}{\Delta_{\eta_z} f}\Big) + \gamma\\ &\leq m(r,f) + N\left(r, \Delta_{\eta_z} f\right) - N\Big(r, \frac{1}{\Delta_{\eta_z} f}\Big) + \gamma.\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Hence, there exists $\delta(r) > 0$ such that

$$m(r,f) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} m\Big(r, \frac{1}{f-a_j}\Big) \leq 2T(r,f) - N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,f) + \gamma \tag{4.9}$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| < \delta(r)$, where

$$N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,f) := 2N(r,f) - N(r, \Delta_{\eta_z} f) + N\Big(r, \frac{1}{\Delta_{\eta_z} f}\Big). \tag{4.10}$$

□

Definition 4.2. Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function, a be a finite complex number, the notation

(i) $n_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\left(r, 1/(f-a)\right)$ represents the number of common zeros of $f - a$ and $\Delta_{\eta_z} f$ in $\overline{D(0,\, r)} := \{z : |z| \leq r\}$ (counting multiplicity), and we define the multiplicity to be the minimum of those of $f - a$ and $\Delta_{\eta_z} f$ for such points;

(ii) $n_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, f) := n_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r;\, 0;\, 1/f)$, which stands for the number of common zeros of $1/f$ and $\Delta_{\eta_z} 1/f$ in $\overline{D(0,\, r)}$ (counting multiplicity), the multiplicity is defined to be the minimum of those of $1/f$ and $\Delta_{\eta_z} 1/f$ for such points.

Definition 4.3. We define the *varying-steps difference integrated counting function* of $f(z)$ to be

(4.11)
$$N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\Big(r,\, \frac{1}{f-a}\Big) := \int_0^r \frac{n_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\Big(t,\, \frac{1}{f-a}\Big) - n_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\Big(0,\, \frac{1}{f-a}\Big)}{t}\, dt + n_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\Big(0,\, \frac{1}{f-a}\Big)\, \log r,$$

$$N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, f) := \int_0^r \frac{n_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(t,\, f) - n_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(0,\, f)}{t} dt + n_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(0,\, f)\, \log r. \tag{4.12}$$

Besides,

$$\widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, 1/(f-a)) := N(r,\, 1/(f-a)) - N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, 1/(f-a)), \tag{4.13}$$

$$\widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, f) := N(r,\, f) - N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, f). \tag{4.14}$$

We have the following Second Main Theorem for varying-steps difference operator with vanishing period.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function such that $\Delta_{\eta_z} f \not\equiv 0$ in $D(0,\, r) := \{z : |z| \le r\}$. Let $a_1, \cdots, a_p$ be $p \ge 2$ distinct points in $\mathbb{C}$. Then, there exists $\delta'(r) > 0$ such that*

$$(p-1)\, T(r,\, f) \le \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, f) + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, 1/(f-a_k)) + \widehat{\varepsilon}(r) \tag{4.15}$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| < \delta'(r)$, where $|\widehat{\varepsilon}(r)| \le n(0,\, f(z)) \log r + \gamma$, here, γ is a constant which depends on $a_1, \cdots, a_p$ and is independent of z, and $\lim\limits_{r\to\infty} \delta'(r) = 0$.

Proof. From Theorem 4.1, we can get

(4.16)
$$(p-1)\, T(r,\, f) \le \sum_{k=1}^{p} N\big(r, 1/(f-a_k)\big) + N\big(r,\, \Delta_{\eta_z} f\big) - N\big(r,\, 1/\Delta_{\eta_z} f\big) - N(r,\, f) + \gamma$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| < \delta(r)$.

According to Definition 4.3, we have

(4.17)
$$\sum_{k=1}^{p} N(r,\, 1/(f-a_k)) - \sum_{k=1}^{p} \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, 1/(f-a_k)) = \sum_{k=1}^{p} N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r,\, 1/(f-a_k)) \le N(r,\, 1/\Delta_{\eta_z} f),$$

then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p} N(r, 1/(f-a_k)) - N(r, 1/\Delta_{\eta_z} f) \le \sum_{k=1}^{p} \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(r, 1/(f-a_k)). \tag{4.18}$$

Moreover, if $z = z_0$ is a common pole of $f(z)$ and $f(z+\eta)$ with multiplicity m_1 and m_2 respectively, then we can write

$$f(z) = \frac{g(z)}{(z-z_0)^{m_1}}, \quad f(z+\eta) = \frac{h(z)}{(z-z_0)^{m_2}}, \tag{4.19}$$

where both $g(z)$ and $h(z)$ are analytic at $z = z_0$ and $g(z_0) \neq 0,\ h(z_0) \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $m_1 \geq m_2$. Thus,

$$\Delta_{\eta_z} f := f(z+\eta) - f(z) = \frac{(z-z_0)^{m_1-m_2} h(z) - g(z)}{(z-z_0)^{m_1}} \tag{4.20}$$

and

$$\Delta_{\eta_z} \frac{1}{f} := \frac{1}{f(z+\eta)} - \frac{1}{f(z)} = \frac{(z-z_0)^{m_2}\left[g(z) - (z-z_0)^{m_1-m_2} h(z)\right]}{h(z)g(z)}. \tag{4.21}$$

If $m_1 > m_2$, then the multiplicity for $\Delta_{\eta_z} f$ and $\Delta_{\eta_z} \frac{1}{f}$ at $z = z_0$ are m_1 and m_2 respectively, which follows that the minimum multiplicity of $\frac{1}{f}$ and $\Delta_{\eta_z} \frac{1}{f}$ at $z = z_0$ is m_2. If $m_1 = m_2$, we can write $h(z) - g(z) = (z-z_0)^m \cdot d(z)$, where m is a non-negative integer, $d(z)$ is analytic at $z = z_0$ and $d(z_0) \neq 0$. Thus, the multiplicity for $\Delta_{\eta_z} f$ at $z = z_0$ is $m_1 - m$ if $m_1 \geq m$, 0 if $m_1 < m$, and that for $\Delta_{\eta_z} \frac{1}{f}$ at $z = z_0$ is $m_1 + m$, which implies that the minimum multiplicity of $\frac{1}{f}$ and $\Delta_{\eta_z} \frac{1}{f}$ at $z = z_0$ is m_1. Hence, we can deduce

$$N\left(r, \Delta_{\eta_z} f\right) + N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\left(r, f\right) \leq N(r, f) + N(r, f(z+\eta)). \tag{4.22}$$

By Theorem 2.3, we can find $0 < \delta'(r) < \delta(r)$ such that

$$N\left(r, \Delta_{\eta_z} f\right) - N(r, f) \leq \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\left(r,\, f\right) + \varepsilon_1(r) \tag{4.23}$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| < \delta'(r)$. Hence,

$$(p-1)\, T(r,\, f) \leq \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\left(r,\, f\right) + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\left(r,\, 1/(f-a_k)\right) + \widehat{\varepsilon}(r) \tag{4.24}$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| < \delta'(r)$, where $|\widehat{\varepsilon}(r)| \leq n\left(0,\, f(z)\right) \log r + \gamma$.

□

4.1. **Defect relation and Picard's theorem for varying-steps difference operator.** We define the *multiplicity index* and *ramification index* for varying-steps difference operator with vanishing period to be

$$\vartheta_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(a,\, f) := \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{N_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\left(r,\, 1/(f-a)\right)}{T(r,\, f)} \tag{4.25}$$

and

$$\Theta_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(a,\, f) := 1 - \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{\widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\left(r,\, 1/(f-a)\right)}{T(r,\, f)}. \tag{4.26}$$

Then the Theorem 4.4 implies the following corollary immediately.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function such that $\Delta_{\eta_z} f \not\equiv 0$. Then*

$$\sum_{a\in\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \big(\delta(a,f)+\vartheta_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(a,f)\big) \le \sum_{a\in\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \Theta_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}(a,f) \le 2. \tag{4.27}$$

Next, we shall define Picard exceptional values for varying-steps difference operator with vanishing period.

Definition 4.6. We call $a \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is a *Picard exceptional value for varying-steps difference operator with vanishing period* of $f(z)$ if there is a sequence $\eta_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that $\widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_n}}(r, 1/(f-a)) = 0$.

We have the following Picard theorem for varying-steps difference operator with vanishing period.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function having three Picard exceptional values for varying-steps difference operator with vanishing period, then $f(z)$ is a constant.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the three exceptional values are 0, 1 and ∞. By Theorem 4.4, we can find a $\delta'(r) > 0$ such that

$$T(r,f) \le \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\big(r,\, f\big) + \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\big(r,\, 1/f\big) + \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_z}}\big(r,\, 1/(f-1)\big) + \widehat{\varepsilon}(r) \tag{4.28}$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| < \delta'(r)$, where $|\widehat{\varepsilon}(r)| \le n\,(0,\, f(z))\log r + \gamma$, here γ is a bounded constant.

If $f(z)$ is a transcendental meromorphic function, then

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{T(r,f)}{\log r} = \infty. \tag{4.29}$$

Thus, there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$T(r,\, f) > 2\,\widehat{\varepsilon}(r) \tag{4.30}$$

whenever $r \ge r_0$. For each $r \ge r_0$, since $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \eta_n = 0$ $(\eta_n \ne 0)$, so there exists $N(r) > 0$ such that $0 < |\eta_n| < \delta'(r)$ whenever $n > N(r)$. Note that

$$\widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_n}}(r,\, f) = \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_n}}(r\,, 1/f) = \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\eta_n}}\big(r,\, 1/(f-1)\big) = 0 \tag{4.31}$$

whenever $n > N(r)$. Thus, $T(r,f) \le \widehat{\varepsilon}(r)$, which is a contradiction.

Hence, $\Delta_{\eta_n} f \equiv 0$ on $\{z : |z| \le r\}$ whenever $n > N(r)$.

We claim that $f(z)$ is an entire function. For otherwise, there exists z_1 such that $f(z_1) = \infty$, which implies that $1/f(z_1+\eta_n) = 1/f(z_1) = 0$ whenever $n > N(r_1)$, where $r_1 \ge \max\{r_0, |z_1|\}$. Note that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \eta_n = 0$ $(\eta_n \ne 0)$, then z_1 is a non-isolated zero, which is a contradiction. So $f(z)$ must be an entire function.

Moreover, we have $f(\eta_n) = f(0)$ whenever $n > N(r_0)$. By the Identity Theorem, we deduce that $f(z) \equiv f(0)$ on $\mathbb{C}$, which is impossible according to the assumption $f(z)$ being transcendental.

Therefore, $f(z)$ is a rational function, which must reduce to a constant.

□

5. Nevanlinna theory for difference operator with infinite period

Definition 5.1. Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order σ. If $\sigma > 0$, then we define *varying-steps difference operator* by $\Delta_{\omega_z} f := f(z+\omega) - f(z)$, where $0 < |\omega| < r^{\beta}$, $0 < \beta < \min\{1, \sigma\}$. If $\sigma = 0$, then we define $\Delta_{\omega_z} f := f(z+\omega) - f(z)$, where $0 < |\omega| < \log^{\frac{1}{2}} r$ for $r > 1$, and $0 < |\omega| < 1$ for $r \leq 1$.

Based on this definition, we have the following second main theorems.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order σ such that $\Delta_{\omega_z} f \not\equiv 0$. Let $a_1, \cdots, a_p$ be $p \geq 2$ distinct points in $\mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$m(r,\, f) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} m\big(r,\, 1/(f - a_j)\big) \leq 2T(r,\, f) - N_{\Delta_{\omega_z}}(r,\, f) + o\big(T(r,\, f)\big) + O(\log r) \tag{5.1}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure, where

$$N_{\Delta_{\omega_z}}(r,\, f) := 2N(r,\, f) - N(r,\, \Delta_{\omega_z} f) + N\big(r,\, 1/\Delta_{\omega_z} f\big). \tag{5.2}$$

Theorem 5.3. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order σ such that $\Delta_{\omega_z} f \not\equiv 0$. Let $a_1, \cdots, a_p$ be $p \geq 2$ distinct points in $\mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$(p-1)\, T(r,\, f) \leq \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\omega_z}}(r,\, f) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\omega_z}}\big(r,\, 1/(f - a_j)\big) + o\big(T(r,\, f)\big) + O(\log r) \tag{5.3}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure.

An analogue of Picard exceptional values is defined as follows.

Definition 5.4. Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order σ, we call $a \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is a *Picard exceptional value for a varying-steps difference operator with infinite period* if $\widetilde{N}_{\Delta_{\omega_z}}\big(r,\, 1/(f-a)\big) = 0$:

i) if $\sigma > 0$,
   (a) $|\omega_z| = |z|^{\frac{\beta}{2}}$, $0 < \beta < \min\{1, \sigma\}$, for $|z| > 1$, and $|z + \omega_z| < |z| - |z|^{\frac{\beta}{4}}$,
   (b) $|\omega_z| = |z|/2$ for $|z| \leq 1$, and $|z + \omega_z| < \frac{3}{4}|z|$;
ii) if $\sigma = 0$,
   (a) $|\omega_z| = \log^{\frac{1}{4}} |z|$ for $|z| > 1$, and $|z + \omega_z| < |z| - \log^{\frac{1}{8}} |z|$,
   (b) $|\omega_z| = |z|/2$ for $|z| \leq 1$, and $|z + \omega_z| < \frac{3}{4}|z|$.



FIGURE 1. This figure shows the locations of three successive points which lie on the preimage of one *Picard exceptional value for a varying-steps difference operator with infinite period*, where $z_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Then we have the following Picard theorem for difference operator with infinite period.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order σ. Suppose f has three Picard exceptional values with respect to a varying-steps difference operator with infinite period, then $f(z)$ is a constant.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the three exceptional values are 0, 1 and ∞. By Theorem 5.3, if $\Delta_{\omega_z} f \not\equiv 0$, we have

$$T(r,\, f) \leq o(T(r,\, f)) + O(\log r), \tag{5.4}$$

then either $f(z+\omega) \equiv f(z)$ if $f(z)$ is a transcendental meromorphic function or $f(z)$ is a rational function. By the definition of Picard exceptional values for varying-steps difference operator with infinite period, we obtain that the latter case is reduced into a constant.

Next, we consider the case of $f(z)$ being a transcendental meromorphic function with $f(z+\omega) \equiv f(z)$. We claim that $f(z)$ must be an entire function. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\arg\omega = -\arg z$ which is guaranteed under the assumption $|z+\omega_z| < |z| - |z|^{\frac{\beta}{4}}$ and $|z+\omega_z| < \frac{3}{4}z$ for $|z| > 1$ and $|z| \leq 1$ respectively when $\sigma > 0$, and $|z+\omega_z| < |z| - \log^{\frac{1}{8}} |z|$ and $|z+\omega_z| < \frac{3}{4}z$ for $|z| > 1$ and $|z| \leq 1$ respectively when $\sigma = 0$.

Indeed, if $z = \mu_1 \neq 0$ is a pole of $f(z)$, then there is a sequence of poles, written as $\{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mu_n = 0$, of $f(z)$ by $f(z+\omega) \equiv f(z)$. Thus, $z = 0$ is a non-isolated singularity of $f(z)$, which contradicts with $f(z)$ being meromorphic. Hence, the only possible pole of $f(z)$ is $z = 0$. Then we write $f(z) = \frac{g(z)}{z^m}$, where m is the multiplicity of pole at $z = 0$, $g(z)$ is an entire function and $g(0) \neq 0$.

Since $f(z)$ is transcendental, we can find a finite complex number α such that the set $\{z : f(z) = \alpha\}$ is infinite. Thus, we can choose $0 \neq \nu_1 \in \{z : f(z) = \alpha\}$. By $f(z+\omega) \equiv f(z)$, we have a sequence of $\alpha-$points, written as $\{\nu_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \nu_n = 0$, of $f(z)$. So $g(\nu_n) = \nu_n^m f(\nu_n) = \alpha \cdot \nu_n^m$. Note that $g(z)$ is entire, so we can deduce that $g(0) = 0$, which is a contradiction with $g(0) \neq 0$. Hence, $f(z)$ is an entire function.

Set $M = \{z : |z| \leq 10\}$, then $f(M)$ is bounded. For each $z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash M$, we can find a $z_0 \in M$ such that $f(z) = f(z_0)$. Thus, $f(z)$ is bounded, which implies that $f(z)$ is a constant. It contradicts with $f(z)$ being transcendental.

Combining the above two cases, we obtain that $f(z)$ is a constant. □

6. Preliminaries

Lemma 6.1 (see [13], page 60)**.** *Let α be a given constant with $0 < \alpha < 1$, then*

$$\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_k\Big)^{\alpha} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n} x_k^{\alpha}, \tag{6.1}$$

where $x_k \geq 0$ $(k = 1, 2, \cdots, n)$.

Lemma 6.2 (see [13], page 60)**.** *Let $\varphi(x)$ be a positive-valued function on $[a, b]$. Then $\log \varphi(x)$ is integrable and*

$$\frac{1}{b-a}\int_a^b \log \varphi(x)\ dx \leq \log\Big[\frac{1}{b-a}\int_a^b \varphi(x)\ dx\Big]. \tag{6.2}$$

Lemma 6.3 (see [13], page 62)**.** *Let α, $0 < \alpha < 1$ be given, then for every given complex number ω, we have*

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{|re^{i\theta} - \omega|^{\alpha}} d\theta \leq \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)r^{\alpha}}. \tag{6.3}$$

Lemma 6.4 (see [13], page 62)**.** *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function, then*

$$\left|\frac{f'(z)}{f(z)}\right| \leq \frac{8R}{(R-r)^2}\Big(T(R,f) + T\Big(R, \frac{1}{f}\Big)\Big) + \sum_{|a_u|<R} \frac{2}{|z-a_u|} + \sum_{|b_v|<R} \frac{2}{|z-b_v|}, \tag{6.4}$$

where $\{a_u\}$ and $\{b_v\}$ are the sets of zeros and poles of $f(z)$ in $D(0, R)$ respectively.

Lemma 6.5 (see [17])**.** *Let $f(z)$ ba a non-constant meromorphic function, then for all irreducible rational functions in $f(z)$,*

$$R(f) = \frac{P(f)}{Q(f)} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{p} a_i(z) f^i(z)}{\sum_{j=0}^{q} b_j(z) f^j(z)}, \tag{6.5}$$

where $\{a_i(z)\}$ *and* $\{b_j(z)\}$ *are small functions of* $f(z)$*, and* $a_p(z) \not\equiv 0$*,* $b_q(z) \not\equiv 0$*. Then,*

$$T\,(r, R(f)) = \max\{p, q\}T(r, f) + S(r, f). \tag{6.6}$$

Here, we say a meromorphic function $g(z)$ *is a small function of* $f(z)$ *if* $T(r, g) = o(T(r, f))$*.*

Lemma 6.6 (see [2])**.** *Let* α *be a given constant with* $0 < \alpha \leq 1$*. Then there exists a constant* $C_\alpha > 0$ *depending only on* α *such that*

$$\log(1 + x) \leq C_\alpha x^\alpha, \tag{6.7}$$

holds for $x \geq 0$*. In particular,* $C_1 = 1$*.*

Lemma 6.7 (see [2])**.** *Let* α*,* $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ *be given and* C_α *as given in Lemma 6.6. Then for any two complex numbers* z_1 *and* z_2 *which do not vanish simultaneously, we have the inequality*

$$\left|\log\left|\frac{z_1}{z_2}\right|\right| \leq C_\alpha\Big(\left|\frac{z_1 - z_2}{z_2}\right|^\alpha + \left|\frac{z_2 - z_1}{z_1}\right|^\alpha\Big). \tag{6.8}$$

Lemma 6.8 (see [7])**.** *Let* z_1*,* z_2*,* $\cdots$ *be an infinite sequence of complex numbers that has no finite limit point, and that is ordered by increasing moduli. Let* $n(t)$ *denote the number of the points* $\{z_k\}$ *that lie in* $|z| \leq t$*. Let* $\alpha > 1$ *be a given real constant. Then there exists a set* $E \subset (1, \infty)$ *that has finite logarithmic measure, such that if* $|z| \notin E \cup [0, 1]$*, we have*

$$\sum_{|z_k| \leq \alpha r} \frac{1}{|z - z_k|} < \alpha^2 \frac{n\left(\alpha^2 r\right)}{r} \log^\alpha r \log n\left(\alpha^2 r\right), \tag{6.9}$$

where $r = |z|$*.*

7. Proof of Theorem 2.1

Proof. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. Suppose that $f(z)$ has no poles and zeros in $D(0,\, r+1) := \{z : |z| < r+1\}$. Thus, we can choose $|\eta| \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ such that $z + \eta \in D(0, r + 1)$ for all z on $\{z : |z| = r\}$. It follows that $f(z + \eta)/f(z)$ is analytic on $\{z : |z| = r\}$.

Note that $\{z : |z| = r\}$ is a closed set, so $f(z + \eta)/f(z)$ is uniformly continuous on $\{z : |z| = r\}$. Since $\lim\limits_{\eta \to 0} f(z + \eta)/f(z) = 1$, so for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $h_1(r, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\left|\frac{f(z + \eta)}{f(z)}\right| < 1 + \varepsilon \tag{7.1}$$

whenever $|\eta| < h_1(r, \varepsilon)$, where $\lim\limits_{r \to \infty} h_1(r, \varepsilon) = 0$. Hence,

$$m\Big(r, \frac{f(z + \eta)}{f(z)}\Big) < \log(1 + \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon \tag{7.2}$$

whenever $|\eta| < h_1(r, \varepsilon)$.

Therefore,

$$\lim_{\eta\to 0} m\Big(r, \frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big) = 0. \tag{7.3}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\lim_{\eta\to 0} m\Big(r, \frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big) = 0. \tag{7.4}$$

We also deduce

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} m\Big(r, \frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big) \le \varepsilon < 2\varepsilon. \tag{7.5}$$

Hence

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} m\Big(r, \frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r\to\infty} m\Big(r, \frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big) = 0. \tag{7.6}$$

Case 2. Suppose that $f(z)$ has poles and zeros in $D(0,\, r+1)$. We define

$$F(z) = f(z)\frac{\prod_{v=1}^{N}(z-b_v)}{\prod_{u=1}^{M}(z-a_u)}, \tag{7.7}$$

where a_u $(u = 1,\, 2,\, \cdots, M)$ and $b_v (v = 1,\, 2,\, \cdots,\, N)$ are the zeros and poles of $f(z)$ on $D(0,\, r+1)$ respectively. Thus, $F(z)$ does not have poles and zeros on $D(0,\, r+1)$. For all z satisfying $|z| = r$, we can also choose $|\eta| \in \big(0, \frac{1}{2}\big)$ such that $z+\eta \in D(0,\, r+1)$. Moreover,

$$F(z+\eta) = f(z+\eta)\frac{\prod_{v=1}^{N}(z+\eta-b_v)}{\prod_{u=1}^{M}(z+\eta-a_u)}. \tag{7.8}$$

Then,

$$\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)} = \frac{F(z+\eta)}{F(z)}\prod_{u=1}^{M}\frac{z+\eta-a_u}{z-a_u}\prod_{v=1}^{N}\frac{z-b_v}{z+\eta-b_v}. \tag{7.9}$$

It follows from Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.7 with $0 < \alpha < 1$, that

(7.10)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\log\left|\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\right|\right| \le \left|\log\left|\frac{F(z+\eta)}{F(z)}\right|\right| + \sum_{u=1}^{M}\left|\log\left|\frac{z+\eta-a_u}{z-a_u}\right|\right| + \sum_{v=1}^{N}\left|\log\left|\frac{z-b_v}{z+\eta-b_v}\right|\right| \\
&\le \left|\log\left|\frac{F(z+\eta)}{F(z)}\right|\right| + C_\alpha|\eta|^\alpha\left[\sum_{u=1}^{M}\left(\frac{1}{|z-a_u|^\alpha} + \frac{1}{|z+\eta-a_u|^\alpha}\right)\right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{v=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{|z-b_v|^\alpha} + \frac{1}{|z+\eta-b_v|^\alpha}\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

(7.11)
$$\begin{aligned} m\Big(r,\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big)+m\Big(r,\frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big) &\le m\Big(r,\frac{F(z+\eta)}{F(z)}\Big)+m\Big(r,\frac{F(z)}{F(z+\eta)}\Big)\\ &+C_\alpha|\eta|^\alpha\sum_{u=1}^{M}\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\frac{1}{|re^{i\theta}-a_u|^\alpha}d\theta+\quad\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\frac{1}{|re^{i\theta}+\eta-a_u|^\alpha}d\theta\right)\\ &+C_\alpha|\eta|^\alpha\sum_{v=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\frac{1}{|re^{i\theta}-b_v|^\alpha}d\theta+\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\frac{1}{|re^{i\theta}+\eta-b_v|^\alpha}d\theta\right)\\ &\le m\Big(r,\frac{F(z+\eta)}{F(z)}\Big)+m\Big(r,\frac{F(z)}{F(z+\eta)}\Big)+\frac{2C_\alpha|\eta|^\alpha}{(1-\alpha)r^\alpha}(M+N)\\ &\le m\Big(r,\frac{F(z+\eta)}{F(z)}\Big)+m\Big(r,\frac{F(z)}{F(z+\eta)}\Big)+\frac{2C_\alpha|\eta|^\alpha}{(1-\alpha)r^\alpha}\left[n\left(r+1,f\right)+n\Big(r+1,\frac{1}{f}\Big)\right] \end{aligned}$$

Since F is free of zeros and poles in $|z|<r$, so we can apply Case 1 and the last inequality (7.11) to $F(z)$, to deduce

$$\lim_{\eta\to0}m\Big(r,\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big)=0,\quad\text{and}\quad\lim_{\eta\to0}m\Big(r,\frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big)=0. \tag{7.12}$$

On the other hand, we choose $\alpha=\frac{1}{2}$ in (7.11), and since $0<|\eta|<\alpha_1(r)$, where $\alpha_1(r)=\min\left\{1/r,\,1/\left(n(r+1)\right)^2\right\}$, $n(r)=n(r,\,f)+n\left(r,1/f\right)$, we have

(7.13)
$$m\Big(r,\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big)+m\Big(r,\frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big)\le m\Big(r,\frac{F(z+\eta)}{F(z)}\Big)+m\Big(r,\frac{F(z)}{F(z+\eta)}\Big)+\frac{4C_{\frac12}}{r^{\frac12}},$$

which clearly tends to zero as $r\to\infty$. This proves (2.1). □

8. Proof of Corollary 2.2

Proof. Since (2.2) holds for each positive real number r. Given $\varepsilon>0$, then there exists $h(r,\,\varepsilon)>0$ such that

$$m\Big(r,\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big)<\varepsilon\quad\text{and}\quad m\Big(r,\frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big)<\varepsilon$$

whenever $|\eta|<h(r,\,\varepsilon)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} m(r,\,f(z)) &\le m\Big(r,\frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big)+m(r,f(z+\eta))\\ &\le m(r,f(z))+m\Big(r,\frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big)+m\Big(r,\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$-m\Big(r,\frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big)\le m(r,f(z+\eta))-m(r,f(z))\le m\Big(r,\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big).$$

This implies

$$|m(r,f(z+\eta))-m(r,f(z))|\leq m\Big(r,\frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big)+m\Big(r,\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big)<2\varepsilon$$

whenever $|\eta|<h(r,\varepsilon)$. Therefore

$$\lim_{\eta\to 0} m\left(r,f(z+\eta)\right)=m\left(r,f(z)\right).$$

□

9. Proof of Theorem 2.3

Proof. Let $\alpha_2(r)$ be defined in (2.4). Since $0<|\eta|<\alpha_2(r)$, then $n(0,f(z+\eta))=0$.

Applying the argument in [2, (5.1), (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4)], we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}&|N(r,f(z+\eta))-N(r,f(z))|\\ &\leq|\eta|\Bigg(\sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu-\eta|<r,\\ b_\mu\neq 0}}\frac{1}{|b_\mu-\eta|}+\sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu|<r,\\ b_\mu-\eta\neq 0}}\frac{1}{|b_\mu|}\Bigg)+n\left(0,f(z)\right)\log r.\end{aligned}\tag{9.1}$$

Note that $f(z)$ has no poles in $\overline{D}(0,\,h)\setminus\{0\}$, this implies that

$$\sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu-\eta|\leq|\eta|,\\ b_\mu\neq 0}}\frac{1}{|b_\mu-\eta|}=0\tag{9.2}$$

under the assumption $0<|\eta|<\alpha_2(r)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu-\eta|<r,\\ b_\mu\neq 0}}\frac{1}{|b_\mu-\eta|}&=\sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu-\eta|\leq|\eta|,\\ b_\mu\neq 0}}\frac{1}{|b_\mu-\eta|}+\sum_{|\eta|<|b_\mu-\eta|<r}\frac{1}{|b_\mu-\eta|}\\ &\leq\sum_{|\eta|<|b_\mu-\eta|<r}\frac{1}{|b_\mu|}\cdot\Big(1+\Big|\frac{\eta}{b_\mu-\eta}\Big|\Big)\\ &\leq 2\sum_{|\eta|<|b_\mu-\eta|<r}\frac{1}{|b_\mu|}\leq 2\sum_{0<|b_\mu|<r+|\eta|}\frac{1}{|b_\mu|}.\end{aligned}\tag{9.3}$$

We deduce from (9.1) and (9.3)

$$|N\big(r,\,f(z+\eta)\big)-N(r,\,f(z))|\leq 3|\eta|\Big(\sum_{0<|b_\mu|<r+|\eta|}\frac{1}{|b_\mu|}\Big)+n\left(0,f(z)\right)\log r.\tag{9.4}$$

Since $0<|\eta|<\alpha_2(r)$, so

$$|N(r,f(z+\eta))-N(r,f(z))|\leq n\left(0,f(z)\right)\log r+3.\tag{9.5}$$

Hence,

$$N(r,f(z+\eta))=N(r,f(z))+\varepsilon_1(r),\tag{9.6}$$

where $|\varepsilon_1(r)|\leq n\left(0,f(z)\right)\log r+3$.

□

10. Proof of Theorem 2.4

Proof. It from the proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 that for each $r > 0$, there exists $\beta(r) > 0$ such that whenever $0 < |\eta| < \beta(r)$

$$\begin{aligned} T\big(r,\, f(z+\eta)\big) &= m(r,\, f(z+\eta)) + N(r,\, f(z+\eta)) \\ &\le m(r,\, f(z)) + m\Big(r,\, \frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big) + N(r,\, f(z+\eta)) \\ &= T(r,\, f(z)) + \varepsilon_1(r) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

where $|\varepsilon_1(r)| \le n\,(0, f(z)) \log r + 3$. Similarly, we have

$$T(r,\, f(z)) \le T\big(r,\, f(z+\eta)\big) + \varepsilon_1(r) + 1.$$

This proves (2.6). □

11. Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof. Since $f(z)$ is of finite order σ, then

$$T(r, f) = O(r^{\sigma+\varepsilon}). \tag{11.1}$$

By choosing $R = 2r$, $R' = 3r$ and $\alpha = 1 - \varepsilon$ in [2, Theorem 2.4], we have

$$m\Big(r,\, \frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}\Big) + m\Big(r,\, \frac{f(z)}{f(z+\eta)}\Big) = O\big(r^{\sigma-(1-\beta)(1-\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\big). \tag{11.2}$$

□

12. proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof.

(1) If σ is nonzero, then we again apply [2, (5.1–4)] to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &|N\big(r,\, f(z+\omega)\big) - N(r,\, f(z))| \\ \le\ & |\omega| \Bigg(\sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu-\omega|<r,\\ b_\mu\neq 0}} \frac{1}{|b_\mu-\omega|} + \sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu|<r,\\ b_\mu-\omega\neq 0}} \frac{1}{|b_\mu|} \Bigg) + O\left(\log r\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12.1}$$

Note that $|\omega| < r^\beta < r$ and $r > 1$, then

$$\sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu-\omega|<r,\\ b_\mu\neq 0}} \frac{1}{|b_\mu-\omega|} = \sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu-\omega|\le|\omega|,\\ b_\mu\neq 0}} \frac{1}{|b_\mu-\omega|} + \sum_{|\omega|<|b_\mu-\omega|<r} \frac{1}{|b_\mu-\omega|}. \tag{12.2}$$

We choose $0 < \varepsilon < \min\{\sigma(1-\beta)/\beta,\ 1-\beta\}$ when $\sigma \ge 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \min\{\sigma(1-\beta)/\beta,\ 1-\sigma\}$ when $0 < \sigma < 1$. Lemma 6.8 implies, with $\alpha = 2$, that

(12.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu-\omega|\le|\omega|,\\ b_\mu\neq 0}} \frac{1}{|b_\mu-\omega|} &\le \sum_{|b_\mu|\le 2|\omega|} \frac{1}{|\omega-b_\mu|} \le 4\cdot\frac{n\,(4|\omega|)}{|\omega|}\cdot\log^2|\omega|\cdot\log n\,(4|\omega|) \\ &= O\left(|\omega|^{\sigma-1+\varepsilon}\cdot\log^3|\omega|\right) \end{aligned}$$

when $|\omega|$ is sufficiently large and outside a set of finite logarithmic measure of $|\omega|$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{|\omega|<|b_\mu-\omega|<r}\frac{1}{|b_\mu-\omega|} &\le \sum_{|\omega|<|b_\mu-\eta|<r}\frac{1}{|b_\mu|}\cdot\Big(1+\Big|\frac{\omega}{b_\mu-\omega}\Big|\Big)\\ &< \sum_{|\omega|<|b_\mu-\omega|<r}\frac{2}{|b_\mu|}\le\sum_{0<|b_\mu|<2r}\frac{2}{|b_\mu|},\end{aligned}\tag{12.4}$$

thus,

(12.5)

$$|N(r,\,f(z+\omega))-N(r,f(z))|\le 3|\omega|\Big(\sum_{0<|b_\mu|<2r}\frac{1}{|b_\mu|}\Big)+O\left(|\omega|^{\sigma+\varepsilon}\cdot\log^3|\omega|\right)+O(\log r).$$

But standard argument (see e.g. [2, (5.9)–(5.12)] implies that

$$\sum_{0<|b_\mu|<2r}\frac{1}{|b_\mu|}=O\left(r^{\sigma-1+\varepsilon}\right)\tag{12.6}$$

when $\sigma\ge 1$ and

$$\sum_{0<|b_\mu|<2r}\frac{1}{|b_\mu|}=O(1)\tag{12.7}$$

when $\sigma<1$. Hence,

$$N\big(r,\,f(z+\omega)\big)=N(r,\,f)+O\big(r^{\beta(\sigma+\varepsilon)}\cdot\log^3 r\big)+O\big(r^{\sigma-(1-\beta)+\varepsilon}\big)+O\left(r^{\beta}\right)\tag{12.8}$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure of $|\omega|$ and hence of $|r|$.This gives (3.2) and (3.3).

(2) If $\sigma=\sigma(f)=0$, then we choose $|\omega|<\log^{\frac{1}{2}} r<r$ for $r>1$, then it follows similarly from (12.2) and the Lemma 6.8, with a different ε, $0<\varepsilon<1$, we have

(12.9)

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{0<|b_\mu-\omega|\le|\omega|,\\ b_\mu\ne 0}}\frac{1}{|b_\mu-\omega|}&\le\sum_{|b_\mu|\le 2|\omega|}\frac{1}{|\omega-b_\mu|}\le 4\cdot\frac{n\left(4|\omega|\right)}{|\omega|}\cdot\log^2|\omega|\cdot\log n\left(4|\omega|\right)\\ &=O\left(|\omega|^{\varepsilon-1}\cdot\log^3|\omega|\right)\end{aligned}$$

when $|\omega|$ is sufficiently large and outside a set of finite logarithmic measure of $|\omega|$.

It follows from (12.4), (12.9) that

(12.10)

$$|N(r,f(z+\omega))-N(r,f(z))|\le 3|\omega|\Big(\sum_{0<|b_\mu|<2r}\frac{1}{|b_\mu|}\Big)+O\left(|\omega|^{\varepsilon}\cdot\log^3|\omega|\right)+O(\log r).$$

Note that $\sigma=\sigma(f)=0$, so that (12.7) applies. Hence,

(12.11)

$$N(r,f(z+\omega))=N(r,f)+O\big(\log^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} r\cdot\log^3\log r\big)+O\left(\log r\right)=N(r,\,f)+O(\log r)$$

outside a set of finite logarithmic measure. □

13. Applications of vanishing period

It is known that one can recover the classical Painlevé equations from the corresponding discrete Painlevé equations taking suitable limits of specifically designed change of variables. See for example, [11] and [6]. We consider limits of different sort between certain discrete equations and their continuous counterparts below, by making use of what we have established in this paper.

Example 13.1. If the difference equation

(13.1)
$$f(z+\eta)-f(z)=R(f(z),z,\eta)=\frac{a_0(z,\eta)+a_1(z,\eta)f(z)+\cdots+a_p(z,\eta)f^p(z)}{b_0(z,\eta)+b_1(z,\eta)f(z)+\cdots+b_q(z,\eta)f^q(z)}$$

with rational coefficients $a_i(z,\eta)$ $(i=1,\cdots,p)$, $b_j(z,\eta)$ $(j=1,\cdots,q)$, admits a transcendental meromorphic solution $f(z)$ which is independent of η, where η is a nonzero small parameter such that

$$\lim_{\eta\to 0}\frac{R(f(z),z,\eta)}{\eta}=\widehat{R}(f(z),z)$$

is a rational function of $f(z)$ with rational coefficients. Then, $q=0$ and $p\leq 2$. Moreover, (13.1) will be reduced into a Riccati differential equation of the form $f'(z)=a(z)+b(z)f(z)+c(z)f^2(z)$ with rational coefficients after taking a limit.

Proof. Since η is independent of z, so we can regard it as a constant for $f(z)$. By (13.1) and Lemma 6.5, we have

(13.2)
$$\begin{aligned}&\max\{p,q\}T(r,f(z))=T(r,R(f(z),z,\eta))+S(r,f(z))\\&=T(r,f(z+\eta)-f(z))+S(r,f(z))\leq T(r,f(z+\eta))+T(r,f(z))+S(r,f(z)).\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\eta\to 0$, combining Theorem 2.4, we can deduce that

$$\max\{p,q\}T(r,f(z))\leq 2T(r,f(z))+\varepsilon(r)+S(r,f(z)),\tag{13.3}$$

which is followed by $\max\{p,q\}\leq 2$.

On the other hand, note that (13.1) can be written as

$$\frac{f(z+\eta)-f(z)}{\eta}=\frac{R(f(z),z,\eta)}{\eta}.\tag{13.4}$$

Letting $\eta\to 0$, we get

$$f'(z)=\widehat{R}(f(z),z),\tag{13.5}$$

which is Malmquist's equation.

By the assumption and Malmquist's theorem (see [15, page 193]), we get (13.5) is a Riccati differential equation of the form

$$f'(z)=a(z)+b(z)f(z)+c(z)f^2(z)\tag{13.6}$$

with rational coefficients. Therefore, $q=0$ and $p\leq 2$. □

Example 13.2. If the difference equation

$$\begin{aligned} &f(z+\eta_1+\eta_2)-f(z+\eta_1)-f(z+\eta_2)+f(z)=R(f(z),z,\eta_1,\eta_2)\\ &=\frac{a_0(z,\eta_1,\eta_2)+a_1(z,\eta_1,\eta_2)f(z)+\cdots+a_p(z,\eta_1,\eta_2)f^p(z)}{b_0(z,\eta_1,\eta_2)+b_1(z,\eta_1,\eta_2)f(z)+\cdots+b_q(z,\eta_1,\eta_2)f^q(z)} \end{aligned} \tag{13.7}$$

with rational coefficients $a_i(z,\eta_1,\eta_2)$ $(i=1,\cdots,p)$, $b_j(z,\eta_1,\eta_2)$ $(j=1,\cdots,q)$, admits a transcendental meromorphic solution $f(z)$ which is independent of η_1 and η_2 such that both the $\lim\limits_{\eta_1\to 0}\frac{R(f(z),z,\eta_1,\eta_2)}{\eta_1}=R_1(f(z),z,\eta_2)$ and the $\lim\limits_{\eta_2\to 0}\lim\limits_{\eta_1\to 0}=\frac{R(f(z),z,\eta_1,\eta_2)}{\eta_1\eta_2}=\lim\limits_{\eta_2\to 0}\frac{R_1(f(z),z,\eta_2)}{\eta_2}=R_2(f(z),z)$ are rational functions of $f(z)$ with rational coefficients. Then either (13.7) will be reduced into Painlevé equations (I) or (II) after taking limits, which implies that $q=0$ and $p\le 3$, or (13.7) will be transformed into a reducible second order differential equation or that without Painlevé property.

Proof. Since η_1 and η_2 are independent of z, so we can view them as constants for $f(z)$. By (13.7) and Lemma 6.5, we have

(13.8)

$$\begin{aligned} &\max\{p,q\}T(r,f(z))=T(r,R(f(z),z,\eta_1,\eta_2))+S(r,f(z))\\ &=T(r,f(z+\eta_1+\eta_2)-f(z+\eta_1)-f(z+\eta_2)+f(z))+S(r,f(z))\\ &\le T(r,f(z+\eta_1+\eta_2))+T(r,f(z+\eta_1))+T(r,f(z+\eta_2))+T(r,f(z))+S(r,f(z)). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\eta_1\to 0$ and $\eta_2\to 0$, combining Theorem 2.4, we can deduce that

$$\max\{p,q\}T(r,f(z))\le 4T(r,f(z))+3\varepsilon(r)+S(r,f(z)), \tag{13.9}$$

which is followed by $\max\{p,q\}\le 4$.
On the other hand, noting that (13.7) can be written as

$$\frac{f(z+\eta_2+\eta_1)-f(z+\eta_2)}{\eta_1}-\frac{f(z+\eta_1)-f(z)}{\eta_1}=\frac{R(f(z),z,\eta_1,\eta_2)}{\eta_1}. \tag{13.10}$$

Letting $\eta_1\to 0$, we get

$$\frac{f'(z+\eta_2)-f'(z)}{\eta_2}=\frac{1}{\eta_2}\cdot R_1(f(z),z,\eta_2). \tag{13.11}$$

Letting $\eta_2\to 0$, we have

$$f''(z)=R_2(f(z),z). \tag{13.12}$$

Then, either (13.12) is a reducible second-order differential equation, which can be solved by known special functions, or that without Painlevé property or it is $P_I: f''(z)=6f^2(z)+z$ or $P_{II}: f''(z)=2f^3(z)+zf(z)+\alpha$, where α is a constant[see [14], Section 14.4].
Under the second case, we can deduce that $q=0$ and $p\le 3$. □

The following theorem is an analogue of Clunie lemma. Although the basic idea goes back to that of Clunie [15], we apply our Theorem 2.1 instead of the logarithmic derivative estimate [15] and the logarithmic difference estimate [2] to obtain it.

Theorem 13.3. *Let $f(z)$ be a nonconstant meromorphic solution of*

$$f^n(z)P(z,f) = Q(z,f), \tag{13.13}$$

where $P(z,f)$ and $Q(z,f)$ are difference polynomials in $f(z)$ and its steps of shifts are nonzero parameters. If the degree of $Q(z,f)$ is at most n, then

$$\lim_{\Gamma\to 0} m\left(r, P(z,f)\right) = o(T(r,f)), \tag{13.14}$$

where Γ is the set of all these steps in $P(z,f)$. Here, $\Gamma \to 0$ means the maximum length of the steps tends to zero.

14. A re-formulation of logarithmic derivative lemma

We give an alternative derivation of Nevanlinna's original logarithmic derivative lemma $m(r,\, f'/f) = O(\log r)$ via a limiting process of a new difference-type estimate of

$$m\Big(r,\, \frac{1}{\eta}\Big(\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)} - 1\Big)\Big) \longrightarrow m\Big(r,\, \frac{f'}{f}\Big), \qquad \eta \to 0.$$

Theorem 14.1. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function, r, R and R' be three positive real numbers satisfying $0 < r < R < R'$, and $0 < \alpha < 1$ be a constant, then*

(14.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\eta\to 0} m\left(r, \frac{1}{\eta}\left(\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)} - 1\right)\right) \\
&\le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(1 + \frac{8R^\alpha}{(R-r)^{2\alpha}}\left(T^\alpha(R,f) + T^\alpha\left(R, \frac{1}{f}\right)\right) + \frac{3\left(N(R',f) + N\left(R', \frac{1}{f}\right)\right)}{(1-\alpha)r^\alpha \log\frac{R'}{R}}\right) \\
&+ \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(2^\alpha + \frac{N(R',f) + N\left(R', \frac{1}{f}\right)}{(1-\alpha)r^\alpha \log\frac{R'}{R}}\right) + 2\log 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. If $f(z)$ does not have zeros and poles in $\overline{D}(0,\, R)$, then $f(z)$ is analytic on $D(0,R) := \{z : |z| < R\}$. Thus, for all z satisfying $|z| = r < R$, we can choose $|\eta|(> 0)$ sufficiently small such that $z + \eta \in D(0,R)$ and

$$f(z+\eta) - f(z) = \eta f'(z) + o(\eta). \tag{14.2}$$

So

$$\frac{1}{\eta}\Big(\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)} - 1\Big) = \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} + \frac{o(\eta)}{\eta}\frac{1}{f(z)}. \tag{14.3}$$

Since $f(z)$ does not have zeros in $\overline{D}(0,R)$, then $1/f(z)$ is analytic on $D(0,R)$ and continuous on $\overline{D}(0,R)$. By the Maximum Modulus Principle, there exists $M_1 > 0$ such that $|1/f(z)| < M_1$ for all $z \in D(0,R)$.

We further choose $|\eta|(>0)$ sufficiently small such that $|\frac{o(\eta)}{\eta}\frac{1}{f(z)}|<\frac{1}{2}$ for all $z\in D(0,R)$. Hence, when $|\eta|(>0)$ is sufficiently small, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m\Big(r,\frac{1}{\eta}\Big(\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}-1\Big)\Big) &\le m\Big(r,\frac{f'(z)}{f(z)}\Big)+m\Big(r,\frac{o(\eta)}{\eta}\frac{1}{f(z)}\Big)+\log 2\\ &\le m\Big(r,\frac{f'(z)}{f(z)}\Big)+\log 2. \end{aligned} \tag{14.4}$$

Case 2. If $f(z)$ has zeros and poles in $\overline{D}(0,R)$, then we define

$$F(z)=f(z)\frac{\prod_{v=1}^{N}(z-b_v)}{\prod_{u=1}^{M}(z-a_u)}, \tag{14.5}$$

where $a_u(u=1,2,\cdots,M)$ and $b_v(v=1,2,\cdots,N)$ are the zeros and poles of $f(z)$ on $\overline{D}(0,R)$ respectively. Thus, $F(z)$ does not have poles and zeros on $\overline{D}(0,R)$.

For all z satisfying $|z|=r<R$, we can choose $|\eta|(>0)$ sufficiently small such that $z+\eta\in D(0,R)$. We deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\eta}\Big(\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}-1\Big)\\ &=\frac{1}{\eta}\Big(\frac{F(z+\eta)}{F(z)}-1\Big)+\frac{F(z+\eta)}{F(z)}\cdot\frac{1}{\eta}\Big(\prod_{u=1}^{M}\frac{z+\eta-a_u}{z-a_u}\prod_{v=1}^{N}\frac{z-b_v}{z+\eta-b_v}-1\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{14.6}$$

From (14.5), we can get

$$\log F(z)=\log f(z)+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\log(z-b_v)-\sum_{u=1}^{M}\log(z-a_u)+2k\pi i, \tag{14.7}$$

for some $k\in\mathbb{Z}$. Taking logarithmic derivative on both sides of (14.5) and an application of Lemma 6.4, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \Big|\frac{F'(z)}{F(z)}\Big| &\le \Big|\frac{f'(z)}{f(z)}\Big|+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{1}{|z-b_v|}+\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{1}{|z-a_u|}\\ &\le \frac{8R}{(R-r)^2}\Big(T(R,f)+T\Big(R,\frac{1}{f}\Big)\Big)+\sum_{|a_u|<R}\frac{2}{|z-a_u|}+\sum_{|b_v|<R}\frac{2}{|z-b_v|}\\ &\quad+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{1}{|z-b_v|}+\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{1}{|z-a_u|}\\ &\le \frac{8R}{(R-r)^2}\Big(T(R,f)+T\Big(R,\frac{1}{f}\Big)\Big)+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{3}{|z-b_v|}+\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{3}{|z-a_u|}. \end{aligned} \tag{14.8}$$

From (14.8) and Lemma 6.1, by choosing $0 < \alpha < 1$, we get

(14.9)
$$\begin{aligned}
&\log^+\left|\frac{F'(z)}{F(z)}\right| \le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(1+\left|\frac{F'(z)}{F(z)}\right|\right)^{\alpha}\\
&\le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(1+\frac{8R}{(R-r)^2}\Big(T(R,f)+T\Big(R,\frac{1}{f}\Big)\Big)+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{3}{|z-b_v|}+\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{3}{|z-a_u|}\right)^{\alpha}\\
&\le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(1+\frac{8R^{\alpha}}{(R-r)^{2\alpha}}\Big(T^{\alpha}(R,f)+T^{\alpha}\Big(R,\frac{1}{f}\Big)\Big)+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{3}{|z-b_v|^{\alpha}}+\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{3}{|z-a_u|^{\alpha}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, combining Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 6.2, we obtain that

(14.10)
$$m\Big(r,\frac{F'(z)}{F(z)}\Big) \le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(1+\frac{8R^{\alpha}}{(R-r)^{2\alpha}}\Big(T^{\alpha}(R,f)+T^{\alpha}\Big(R,\frac{1}{f}\Big)\Big)+\frac{3}{(1-\alpha)r^{\alpha}}(M+N)\right)$$

Note that $0 < R < R'$, we have

$$n(R,f) \le \frac{N(R',f)}{\log\frac{R'}{R}}, \quad \text{and} \quad n\Big(R,\frac{1}{f}\Big) \le \frac{N\Big(R',\frac{1}{f}\Big)}{\log\frac{R'}{R}}. \tag{14.11}$$

Combining (14.10), (14.11), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
m\Big(r,\frac{F'(z)}{F(z)}\Big) \le &\frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(1+\frac{8R^{\alpha}}{(R-r)^{2\alpha}}\left(T^{\alpha}(R,f)+T^{\alpha}\Big(R,\frac{1}{f}\Big)\right)\right.\\
&\left.+\frac{3\left(N(R',f)+N\Big(R',\frac{1}{f}\Big)\right)}{(1-\alpha)r^{\alpha}\log\frac{R'}{R}}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{14.12}$$

On the other hand, by L'Hospital Rule, we have

$$\lim_{\eta\to 0}\frac{1}{\eta}\left(\prod_{u=1}^{M}\frac{z+\eta-a_u}{z-a_u}\prod_{v=1}^{N}\frac{z-b_v}{z+\eta-b_v}-1\right)=\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{1}{z-a_u}-\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{1}{z-b_v}, \tag{14.13}$$

so that

(14.14)
$$\lim_{\eta\to 0}\left|\frac{1}{\eta}\cdot\prod_{u=1}^{M}\frac{z+\eta-a_u}{z-a_u}\prod_{v=1}^{N}\frac{z-b_v}{z+\eta-b_v}-1\right|<\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{1}{|z-a_u|}+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{1}{|z-b_v|}+1.$$

Hence, there exists $h > 0$ such that

$$\left|\frac{1}{\eta}\cdot\prod_{u=1}^{M}\frac{z+\eta-a_u}{z-a_u}\prod_{v=1}^{N}\frac{z-b_v}{z+\eta-b_v}-1\right|<\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{1}{|z-a_u|}+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{1}{|z-b_v|}+1 \tag{14.15}$$

whenever $0 < |\eta| < h$. So by Lemma 6.1, we deduce

(14.16)
$$\log^+\left|\frac{1}{\eta}\cdot\prod_{u=1}^{M}\frac{z+\eta-a_u}{z-a_u}\prod_{v=1}^{N}\frac{z-b_v}{z+\eta-b_v}-1\right| \le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(1+\left|\frac{1}{\eta}\cdot\prod_{u=1}^{M}\frac{z+\eta-a_u}{z-a_u}\prod_{v=1}^{N}\frac{z-b_v}{z+\eta-b_v}-1\right|\right)^{\alpha}$$
$$\le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(2+\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{1}{|z-a_u|}+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{1}{|z-b_v|}\right)^{\alpha} \le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(2^{\alpha}+\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{1}{|z-a_u|^{\alpha}}+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{1}{|z-b_v|^{\alpha}}\right).$$

Combining Lemma 6.2, Lemma 6.3, (14.11) and (14.16), we have

(14.17)
$$m\left(r,\frac{1}{\eta}\cdot\prod_{u=1}^{M}\frac{z+\eta-a_u}{z-a_u}\prod_{v=1}^{N}\frac{z-b_v}{z+\eta-b_v}-1\right)$$
$$\le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(2^{\alpha}+\sum_{u=1}^{M}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\frac{1}{|re^{i\theta}-a_u|^{\alpha}}\,d\theta+\sum_{v=1}^{N}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\frac{1}{|re^{i\theta}-b_v|^{\alpha}}\,d\theta\right)$$
$$\le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(2^{\alpha}+\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)r^{\alpha}}(M+N)\right) = \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(2^{\alpha}+\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)r^{\alpha}}\Big(n(R,f)+n\Big(R,\frac{1}{f}\Big)\Big)\right)$$
$$\le \frac{1}{\alpha}\log\left(2^{\alpha}+\frac{N(R',f)+N\Big(R',\frac{1}{f}\Big)}{(1-\alpha)r^{\alpha}\log\frac{R'}{R}}\right).$$

Clearly, the Case 1 of Theorem 2.1 asserts that

$$\lim_{\eta\to 0} m\Big(r,\frac{F(z+\eta)}{F(z)}\Big)=0. \tag{14.18}$$

Then, the inequality (14.1) follows from (14.4) for $F(z)$, (14.6), (14.12), (14.17) and (14.18). □

In particular, we have the following corollary for finite order meromorphic functions.

Corollary 14.2. *Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order σ, then*

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\lim_{\eta\to 0} m\Big(r,\frac{1}{\eta}\Big(\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}-1\Big)\Big)=O(\log r),\quad when\quad \sigma\ge 1; \tag{14.19}$$

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\lim_{\eta\to 0} m\Big(r,\frac{1}{\eta}\Big(\frac{f(z+\eta)}{f(z)}-1\Big)\Big)=O(1),\quad when\quad \sigma< 1. \tag{14.20}$$

Proof. Since $f(z)$ is a non-constant meromorphic function of finite order σ, then given ε satisfying $0<\varepsilon<2$, we have

$$T(r,f)\le r^{\sigma+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \tag{14.21}$$

when r is sufficiently large. We choose $\alpha=1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, $R=2r$ and $R'=3r$ in Theorem 14.1, then the above limits follow. □

15. Discussion

This paper have established a way that allows one to recover the classical little Picard theorem for meromorphic functions from the corresponding little Picard theorem for difference operators. One way to consider the original little Picard theorem is that it is a consequence of the meromorphic function belonging to the kernel of a differential operator. Our formulations of Nevanlinna theories enable us to see that the meromorphic functions belonging to the respectively kernels of vanishing and infinite periods varying steps difference operators must reduce to constants. This allows us to treat the classical results as limiting cases of the discrete analogues. As the discrete-continuous interplay has always been a new source of inspiration (see e.g. [1]), the current paper offers a concrete approach to achieve this interplay between discrete and continuous operators by ways of Nevanlinna theory.

Acknowledgement. We would like to acknowledge useful comments from their colleague Dr. T. K. Lam during the initial stage of this research.

References

1. M. J. Ablowitz, R. G. Halburd and B.Herbst, On the extension of the Painlevé property to difference equations, Nonlinearity **13** (2000), 889-905.
2. Y. M. Chiang and S. J. Feng, On the Nevanlinna characteristic of $f(z+\eta)$ and difference equations in the complex plane, The Ramanujan J. **16** (2008), 105-129.
3. Y. M. Chiang and S. J. Feng, On the growth of logarithmic differences, difference quotients and logarithmic derivatives of meromorphic functions, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **361** (2009), no. 7, 3767-3791.
4. Y. M. Chiang and S. N. M. Ruijsenaars, On the Nevanlinna order of meromorphic solutions to linear analytic difference equations, Stud. Appl. Math. **116** (2006) 257–287
5. B. Grammaticos, A. Ramani and V. Papageorgiou, Do integrable mappings have the Painlevé property?, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991), 1825-1828.
6. B. Grammaticos, and A. Ramani, Discrete Painlevé equations: an integrability paradigm, Phys. Scr. **89** (2014) 038002 (13pp)
7. G. G. Gundersen, Estimates for the logarithmic derivative of meromorphic functions, plus similar estimates, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **37** (1988), 88-104.
8. R. G. Halburd and R. J. Korhonen, Difference analogue of the lemma on the logarithmic derivative with applications to difference equations, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **314** (2006), 477-487.
9. R. G. Halburd and R. J. Korhonen, Finite-order meromorphic solutions and the discrete Painlevé equations, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **94** (2007), 443-474.
10. R. G. Halburd and R. J. Korhonen, Nevanlinna theory for the difference operator, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. **31** (2006), no. 2, 463-478.
11. R. G. Halburd and R. J. Korhonen, Meromorphic solutions of difference equations, integrability and the discrete Painlevé equations, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40** (2007), R1-R38.
12. W. K. Hayman, Meromorphic Functions, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.
13. Y. He and X. Xiao, Algebroid Functions and Ordinary Differential Equations, Science Press, Beijing (1988) (in Chinese).
14. E. L. Ince, Ordinary Differential Equations, Dover Publications, 1956.
15. I. Laine, Nevanlinna Theory and Complex Differential Equations, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1993.
16. J. Miles, Some examples of the dependence of the Nevanlinna deficiency upon the choice of origin, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **47** (1983), 145-176.
17. A. Z. Mohon'ko, The Nevanlinna characteristics of certain meromorphic functions, Teor. Funkc. Anal. ih Priloz. **14** (1971), 83-87 (in Russian).
18. A. Ramani and B. Grammaticos, Discrete Painlevé equations: coalescences, limits and degeneracies, Physica A **228** (1996), 160-171.

19. G. Valiron, Valeurs exceptionnelles et valeurs déficientes des fonctions méromorphes, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **225** (1947), 556-558.
20. N. Yanagihara, Meromorphic solutions of some difference equations, Funkcial. Ekvac. **23** (1980), no. 3, 309-326.
21. L. Yang, Value distribution theory, Science Press, 1993.

Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong.
E-mail address: machiang@ust.hk

Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong.
E-mail address: xluoab@ust.hk